

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/711,735	LABORCZFALVI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
WILLY W. HUARACHA	2195		
All Participants:	Status of Application: _____		
(1) <u>WILLY W. HUARACHA</u> .	(3) <u>Mia K. Fiedler</u> .		
(2) <u>John D. Lanza</u> .	(4) _____.		
Date of Interview: <u>3 March 2010</u>	Time: _____		
Type of Interview:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Telephonic <input type="checkbox"/> Video Conference <input type="checkbox"/> Personal (Copy given to: <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant's representative)		
Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	If Yes, provide a brief description: _____		
Part I.			
Rejection(s) discussed:			
103 (a)			
Claims discussed:			
1, 26			
Prior art documents discussed:			
US 7,203,941 B2, US Pub. 20030233544 A1			
Part II.			
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:			
See Continuation Sheet			
Part III.			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. <input type="checkbox"/> It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.			
<i>/Meng-Ai An/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2195</i>			
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)			

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Discussed applicants invention in view of the prior art of record to clarify claim language. Also discussed 101 issue of claim 26. Thereafter, the Examiner explained that the invention as claimed still would not overcome the prior art of record given a broadest reasonable interpretation. Examiner introduced a proposal to incorporate limitations of dependent claim 6 into independent claim 1, and similarly incorporate claim 6 into claim 26 including step (b) of claim 1, in order to place the application in condition for allowance. Applicant agreed with the proposal and authorized the Examiner to enter the amendments via examiners amendment.